



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,277	04/13/2004	Sterling Reasor	MSFT122018	4594
26389 7590 12/12/2007 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			EXAMINER PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/12/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/823,277

Applicant(s)

REASOR ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-15 and 31-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/5/06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 16-30 are subject to examination. Claims 1-15 and 31-40 are withdrawn.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-15, are drawn to, “auditing information about a user’s activities using a device over a computer network using XML schema and XML style sheet”, classified in class 709, subclass 224.
 - II. Claims 16-30, are drawn to, “processing parental control information available for access on a computer network using Windows File System database”, classified in class 709, subclass 202.
 - III. Claims 31-40, are drawn to, “an application programming interface to log audit data originated by an application to the data repositories of two devices”, classified in class 719, subclass 328.
3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I to III, are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as, usage of auditing information about a user’s activities using a device over a computer network using XML schema and XML style sheet, lacking one or more of the particulars of inventions II to III. Invention II

has separate utility such as, usage of processing parental control information available for access on a computer network using Windows File System database, lacking one or more of the particulars of inventions of I and III. Invention III has separate utility such as, usage of an application programming interface to log audit data originated by an application to the data repositories of two devices, one or more of the particulars of inventions of I, II. See MPEP 806.05.

4. These inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, and the search required for each Group is different and not co-extensive for examination purpose. For example, the searches for the two inventions would not be co-extensive because these groups would require different searches on PTO's classification class and subclass as following:

(a) Group I search (claims 1-5) would require use of search class 709, subclass 224 (not required for the inventions II and III).

(b) Group II search (claims 16-30) would require use of search class 709, subclass 202 (not required for the inventions I and III).

(c) Group III search (claims 31-40) would require use of search class 719, subclass 328 (not required for the inventions I and II).

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the extensive search required for one group is not required for the other groups, restriction

for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. A telephone call was made to Mr. Gary Kindness on 12/7/07 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement. Mr. Gary Kindness elected invention II (Claims 16-30) without traverse. Hence, claims 1-15, 31-40 are withdrawn.

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined and to cancel withdrawn claims.

Drawings

8. The figures submitted on 4/13/04 are acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

9. An initialed and dated copy of the applicant's IDS form 1449, paper dated 7/5/2006, is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Claim 29 claim a computer-readable medium, which should be a tangible computer storage medium being a memory or other physical medium. Claim 30 claim a system with “operable”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. Claims 16-26, 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by 2004/0210767, Sinclair et al. (Hereinafter Sinclair).

13. Referring to claim 16, SINCLAIR discloses in a computer network having two or more computing devices in communication (e.g., page 2), a method for processing parental control audit data available for access on the network (e.g., page 6), the method comprising: receiving a request from an application to log audit data on a first computing device (e.g., page 4), the audit data associated with a unique identifier of a restricted user (e.g., page 4); receiving a second request from an application to log audit data on a second computing device (e.g., page 4), the

audit data associated with the same restricted user (e.g., page 4); aggregating the logged data on the first computing device with the logged data on the second computing device so that each device contains all of the audit data associated with the restricted user (e.g., page 4); obtaining a user request from one of the computing devices to report all audit data stored on the two or more computing devices associated with the same restricted user; reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device (e.g., page 6).

14. Referring to claim 17, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. SINCLAIR also discloses wherein aggregating the logged data includes replicating the logged data on the first computing device onto the second computing device, and replicating the logged data on the second computing device onto the first computing device (e.g., page 4).

15. Referring to claim 18, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. SINCLAIR also discloses wherein reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device includes reporting the replicated data on the requesting computer device (e.g., page 5).

16. Referring to claim 19, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. SINCLAIR also discloses notifying a user that audit data has been logged by an application (e.g., page 5).

17. Referring to claim 20, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

SINCLAIR also discloses wherein notifying the user includes at least one of notifying the restricted user with whom the audit data is associated and the user that requested the report (e.g., page 4).

18. Referring to claim 21, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

SINCLAIR also discloses wherein the restricted user with whom the audit data is associated is a child (e.g., page 6).

19. Referring to claim 22, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

SINCLAIR also discloses wherein the user that requested the report is a parent (e.g., page 6).

20. Referring to claim 23, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

SINCLAIR also discloses wherein notifying the user is performed periodically to serve as a reminder that logged audit data is available to report (e.g., page 6).

21. Referring to claim 24, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

SINCLAIR also discloses wherein the audit data associated with the restricted user is related to a restriction placed on the restricted user by another user having authorization to place restrictions (e.g., page 6).

22. Referring to claim 25, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. SINCLAIR also discloses wherein receiving the request from the application to log audit data includes a request to log style data associated with the audit data (e.g., page 4), and further wherein reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device is performed in accordance with the associated logged style data (e.g., page 4).

23. Referring to claim 26, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. SINCLAIR also discloses wherein receiving the request from the application to log audit data includes receiving a request to log audit data to a parental control channel from which the logged audit data is periodically transferred to a data repository on the receiving computing device (e.g., page 4).

24. Referring to claim 29, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. SINCLAIR also discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in Claim 16 (e.g., page 2).

25. Referring to claim 30, SINCLAIR discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. SINCLAIR also discloses a computer system having a processor, a memory and an operating system, the computer system operable to perform the method recited in Claim 16 (e.g., page 2).

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. Claims 27, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SINCLAIR in view of "Official Notice".

Referring to claims 27 and 28, SINCLAIR does not specifically mention about wherein the data repository is a table in a Windows File System database and wherein receiving a request to a Windows Shell interface to log the data directly into the table in the Windows File System database. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing SINCLAIR is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wherein the data repository is a table in a Windows File System database and wherein receiving a request to a Windows Shell interface to log the data directly into the table in the Windows File System database with the teachings of SINCLAIR in order to facilitate logging collected information in the Windows File System database using the Windows Shell interface because it would enhance accessing the logged information for Windows based systems.

28. Claims 16-26, 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by 2002/0184496, Mitchell et al. (Hereinafter Mitchell).

29. Referring to claim 16, MITCHELL discloses in a computer network having two or more computing devices in communication (e.g., page 2), a method for processing parental control audit data available for access on the network (e.g., page 6), the method comprising: receiving a request from an application to log audit data on a first computing device (e.g., page 6), the audit data associated with a unique identifier of a restricted user (e.g., page 6); receiving a second request from an application to log audit data on a second computing device (e.g., page 6), the audit data associated with the same restricted user (e.g., page 6); aggregating the logged data on the first computing device with the logged data on the second computing device so that each device contains all of the audit data associated with the restricted user (e.g., page 6); obtaining a user request from one of the computing devices to report all audit data stored on the two or more computing devices associated with the same restricted user; reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device (e.g., page 6).

30. Referring to claim 17, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses wherein aggregating the logged data includes replicating the logged data on the first computing device onto the second computing device, and replicating the logged data on the second computing device onto the first computing device (e.g., page 6).

31. Referring to claim 18, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses wherein reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device includes reporting the replicated data on the requesting computer device (e.g., page 5).

32. Referring to claim 19, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses notifying a user that audit data has been logged by an application (e.g., page 5).

33. Referring to claim 20, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses wherein notifying the user includes at least one of notifying the restricted user with whom the audit data is associated and the user that requested the report (e.g., page 6).

34. Referring to claim 21, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses wherein the restricted user with whom the audit data is associated is a child (e.g., page 6).

35. Referring to claim 22, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses wherein the user that requested the report is a parent (e.g., page 6).

36. Referring to claim 23, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses wherein notifying the user is performed periodically to serve as a reminder that logged audit data is available to report (e.g., page 6).

37. Referring to claim 24, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses wherein the audit data associated with the restricted user is related to a restriction placed on the restricted user by another user having authorization to place restrictions (e.g., page 6).

38. Referring to claim 25, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses wherein receiving the request from the application to log audit data includes a request to log style data associated with the audit data (e.g., page 6), and further wherein reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device is performed in accordance with the associated logged style data (e.g., page 6).

39. Referring to claim 26, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses wherein receiving the request from the application to log audit data includes receiving a request to log audit data to a parental control channel from which the logged audit data is periodically transferred to a data repository on the receiving computing device (e.g., page 6).

40. Referring to claim 29, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in Claim 16 (e.g., page 2).

41. Referring to claim 30, MITCHELL discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. MITCHELL also discloses a computer system having a processor, a memory and an operating system, the computer system operable to perform the method recited in Claim 16 (e.g., page 2).

42. Claims 27, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MITCHELL in view of "Official Notice".

Referring to claims 27 and 28, MITCHELL does not specifically mention about wherein the data repository is a table in a Windows File System database and wherein receiving a request to a Windows Shell interface to log the data directly into the table in the Windows File System database. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing MITCHELL is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wherein the data repository is a table in a Windows File System database and wherein receiving a request to a Windows Shell interface to log the data directly into the table in the Windows File System database with the teachings of MITCHELL in order to facilitate logging collected information in the Windows File System database using the Windows Shell interface because it would enhance accessing the logged information for Windows based systems.

43. Claims 16-26, 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by 2005/0081043, Evans et al. (Hereinafter Evans).

44. Referring to claim 16, EVANS discloses in a computer network having two or more computing devices in communication (e.g., page 2), a method for processing parental control audit data available for access on the network (e.g., page 9), the method comprising: receiving a request from an application to log audit data on a first computing device (e.g., page 4), the audit data associated with a unique identifier of a restricted user (e.g., page 4); receiving a second request from an application to log audit data on a second computing device (e.g., page 4), the audit data associated with the same restricted user (e.g., page 4); aggregating the logged data on the first computing device with the logged data on the second computing device so that each device contains all of the audit data associated with the restricted user (e.g., page 4); obtaining a user request from one of the computing devices to report all audit data stored on the two or more computing devices associated with the same restricted user; reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device (e.g., page 9).

45. Referring to claim 17, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. EVANS also discloses wherein aggregating the logged data includes replicating the logged data on the first computing device onto the second computing device, and replicating the logged data on the second computing device onto the first computing device (e.g., page 4).

46. Referring to claim 18, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. EVANS also discloses wherein reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device includes reporting the replicated data on the requesting computer device (e.g., page 10).

47. Referring to claim 19, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

EVANS also discloses notifying a user that audit data has been logged by an application (e.g., page 10).

48. Referring to claim 20, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

EVANS also discloses wherein notifying the user includes at least one of notifying the restricted user with whom the audit data is associated and the user that requested the report (e.g., page 4).

49. Referring to claim 21, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

EVANS also discloses wherein the restricted user with whom the audit data is associated is a child (e.g., page 9).

50. Referring to claim 22, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

EVANS also discloses wherein the user that requested the report is a parent (e.g., page 9).

51. Referring to claim 23, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

EVANS also discloses wherein notifying the user is performed periodically to serve as a reminder that logged audit data is available to report (e.g., page 9).

52. Referring to claim 24, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

EVANS also discloses wherein the audit data associated with the restricted user is related to a

restriction placed on the restricted user by another user having authorization to place restrictions (e.g., page 9).

53. Referring to claim 25, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. EVANS also discloses wherein receiving the request from the application to log audit data includes a request to log style data associated with the audit data (e.g., page 4), and further wherein reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device is performed in accordance with the associated logged style data (e.g., page 4).

54. Referring to claim 26, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. EVANS also discloses wherein receiving the request from the application to log audit data includes receiving a request to log audit data to a parental control channel from which the logged audit data is periodically transferred to a data repository on the receiving computing device (e.g., page 4).

55. Referring to claim 29, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. EVANS also discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in Claim 16 (e.g., page 2).

56. Referring to claim 30, EVANS discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. EVANS also discloses a computer system having a processor, a memory and an operating system, the computer system operable to perform the method recited in Claim 16 (e.g., page 2).

57. Claims 27, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EVANS in view of "Official Notice".

Referring to claims 27 and 28, EVANS does not specifically mention about wherein the data repository is a table in a Windows File System database and wherein receiving a request to a Windows Shell interface to log the data directly into the table in the Windows File System database. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing EVANS is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wherein the data repository is a table in a Windows File System database and wherein receiving a request to a Windows Shell interface to log the data directly into the table in the Windows File System database with the teachings of EVANS in order to facilitate logging collected information in the Windows File System database using the Windows Shell interface because it would enhance accessing the logged information for Windows based systems.

58. Claims 16-26, 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by 2005/0198319, Chan et al. (Hereinafter Chan).

59. Referring to claim 16, CHAN discloses in a computer network having two or more computing devices in communication (e.g., page 2), a method for processing parental control audit data available for access on the network (e.g., page 2), the method comprising: receiving a

request from an application to log audit data on a first computing device (e.g., page 1), the audit data associated with a unique identifier of a restricted user (e.g., page 1); receiving a second request from an application to log audit data on a second computing device (e.g., page 1), the audit data associated with the same restricted user (e.g., page 1); aggregating the logged data on the first computing device with the logged data on the second computing device so that each device contains all of the audit data associated with the restricted user (e.g., page 1); obtaining a user request from one of the computing devices to report all audit data stored on the two or more computing devices associated with the same restricted user; reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device (e.g., page 2).

60. Referring to claim 17, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses wherein aggregating the logged data includes replicating the logged data on the first computing device onto the second computing device, and replicating the logged data on the second computing device onto the first computing device (e.g., page 1).

61. Referring to claim 18, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses wherein reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device includes reporting the replicated data on the requesting computer device (e.g., page 1).

62. Referring to claim 19, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses notifying a user that audit data has been logged by an application (e.g., page 1).

63. Referring to claim 20, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses wherein notifying the user includes at least one of notifying the restricted user with whom the audit data is associated and the user that requested the report (e.g., page 1).

64. Referring to claim 21, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses wherein the restricted user with whom the audit data is associated is a child (e.g., page 2).

65. Referring to claim 22, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses wherein the user that requested the report is a parent (e.g., page 2).

66. Referring to claim 23, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses wherein notifying the user is performed periodically to serve as a reminder that logged audit data is available to report (e.g., page 2).

67. Referring to claim 24, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses wherein the audit data associated with the restricted user is related to a restriction placed on the restricted user by another user having authorization to place restrictions (e.g., page 2).

68. Referring to claim 25, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses wherein receiving the request from the application to log audit data includes a request to log style data associated with the audit data (e.g., page 1), and further wherein reporting the requested audit data from the aggregated data on the requesting computer device is performed in accordance with the associated logged style data (e.g., page 1).

69. Referring to claim 26, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses wherein receiving the request from the application to log audit data includes receiving a request to log audit data to a parental control channel from which the logged audit data is periodically transferred to a data repository on the receiving computing device (e.g., page 1).

70. Referring to claim 29, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in Claim 16 (e.g., page 2).

71. Referring to claim 30, CHAN discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. CHAN also discloses a computer system having a processor, a memory and an operating system, the computer system operable to perform the method recited in Claim 16 (e.g., page 2).

72. Claims 27, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CHAN in view of "Official Notice".

Referring to claims 27 and 28, CHAN does not specifically mention about wherein the data repository is a table in a Windows File System database and wherein receiving a request to a Windows Shell interface to log the data directly into the table in the Windows File System database. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing CHAN is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wherein the data repository is a table in a Windows File System database and wherein receiving a request to a Windows Shell interface to log the data directly into the table in the Windows File System database with the teachings of CHAN in order to facilitate logging collected information in the Windows File System database using the Windows Shell interface because it would enhance accessing the logged information for Windows based systems.

Conclusion

In order to expedite the prosecution of this case, multiple references are used for the rejections to demonstrate that several references disclose the claimed subject matter of the claims.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



HARESH PATEL

PRIMARY EXAMINER

December 9, 2007